



DoD Medium Assurance PKI Major Directory Challenges

LCDR Paul Friedrichs

Defense Information Systems Agency

PKI Chief Engineer

friedrip@ncr.disa.mil

8 October 1998



DoD Medium Assurance PKI Technical Objectives

- ◆ **Purely standards-based**
 - Support multiple applications and products
- ◆ **Support digital signature and encryption**
- ◆ **Provide functional separation**
 - Support legal non-repudiation
 - Support data recovery
- ◆ **COTS-based**
 - Possible outsource of elements
- ◆ **Support FIPS-compliance requirements**



Client Support For Multi-Valued Directory Attributes

- ◆ **Two Certificates**
 - **keyUsage: digitalSignature, nonRepudiation**
 - **keyUsage: digitalSignature, keyEncipherment & e-mail address in certificate subject (migrating to subjectAltName)**
- ◆ **But clients only use first certificate written to directory**
 - **DAP, LDAP and proprietary clients**
- ◆ **Forced to duplicate entire directory service !**
- ◆ **Need to get the word out to client developers !**



X.500 Data Model Entries

- ◆ **Naming and directory manageability conflict**
 - All requirements must be satisfied with *one* hierarchy
 - ◆ (not the purpose of hierarchical object classes)
 - Uniquely name (currently by DIT territory)
 - Meaningfully name (DN components)
 - ◆ Often need to violate territory
 - Manage information
 - ◆ Delegation
 - ◆ Management instructions at top of each subtree
 - ◆ But subtrees selected to meaningfully name subjects ?
 - Users need to find information
 - ◆ User should not need to see DIT - should just be UI challenge
 - Provide the user any view *they* need
 - ◆ Index across subtrees (used to satisfy management requirements)



X.500 Data Model Entries

- ◆ **Separate hierarchy for each conflicting requirement ?**
 - **Possible kluges of the technology within a domain:**
 - ◆ **Unique leaf RDNs - drag and drop entries to ease management**
 - **Possibly only certify RDN within domain**
 - ◆ **Place all information on central server and index across domain**
 - **Allows web UI that supports *user's* needs**
 - ◆ **Possibly still allows a standard interface to the rest of the world**
- ◆ **Performance (location, push-pull, cache) optimized separately ?**



X.500 Data Model Attributes

- ◆ **Need to delegate *attribute* management**
 - **DIT is perpendicular to organizations' requirements**
 - **This is why we're seeing "meta-directories"**
 - ◆ **Different management requirements for each group of attributes**
 - ◆ **For shared set of "entries"**
 - **Technology invisible to management requirements**
 - ◆ **Possibly reflect each group in a separate DIT**
 - **Using unique RDN as key between management DITs**
 - ◆ **Change in management for group of attributes reflected only once**
 - **At the top of each subtree**
 - **Internal management architecture invisible to outside**
 - ◆ **Possibly still allows standard interface to the rest of the world**



Directories

- ◆ Schema-aware clients vs. three-tier C/S authentication
- ◆ *Delegation* appears to be directory's greatest strength
 - Not necessarily *distribution*
- ◆ Directories are all about politics
 - The technology must thrive in, not ignore, politics
- ◆ Separate central, local and community directory services ?
- ◆ Scalability primarily requires *scalable manageability*
- ◆ Clients must support multi-valued attributes !